arXiv:math/0504583v1 [math.PR] 28 Apr 2005

# Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equation for stochastic differential equations with boundary hitting resets

Julien Bect *,[1], Hana Baili [1], Gilles Fleury [1]

*Department of Signal Processing and Electronic Systems,*
*École Supérieure d'Électricité,*
*3 rue Joliot-Curie, Plateau de Moulon,*
*91192 Gif-sur-Yvette cedex, France.*

---

**Abstract**

We consider a Markov process on a Riemannian manifold, which solves a stochastic differential equation in the interior of the manifold and jumps according to a deterministic reset map when it reaches the boundary. We derive a partial differential equation for the probability density function, involving a non-local boundary condition which accounts for the jumping behaviour of the process. This is a generalisation of the usual Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov equation for diffusion processes. The result is illustrated with an example in the field of stochastic hybrid systems.

*Key words:* Stochastic differential equations, Fokker-Planck equation, Kolmogorov's forward equation, Stochastic Hybrid Systems
*1991 MSC:* 58J65, 60H10, 60J60, 60J75

---

## 1 Introduction

This paper investigates Kolmogorov's forward equation, also called the Fokker-Planck equation (FPE), for a class of Markov processes whose behaviour can be described as follows: let $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$ be a $n$-dimensional smooth[2] manifold with boundary $\partial\mathbb{M}$ and interior $\mathbb{M}$, and let $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{M} \cup \mathbb{T}$ be the topological space obtained by adding to $\mathbb{M}$ a finite (possibly empty) set $\mathbb{T}$ of isolated points.

---

[*] Corresponding author.

[1] Email adresses: Firstname.Lastname@Supelec.fr

[2] "smooth" stands for $C^\infty$, here and throughout the whole paper, even though we do not really need that much regularity to prove our results.

Our process $X$ evolves in $\mathbb{M}$ according to a Stratonovich stochastic differential equation [3] (SDE) on $\mathbb{M}$,

$$\mathrm{d}X_t \;=\; A_0(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t \;+\; \sum_{r=1}^{n} A_r(X_t) \,\circ\, \mathrm{d}B_t^r\,, \tag{$\mathscr{S}$}$$

where $B$ is a $n$-dimensional Wiener process, $\circ\,\mathrm{d}$ denotes the Stratonovich differential, and the $A_r$'s are $n+1$ smooth vector fields on $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$. If $X$ happens to hit the boundary $\partial\mathbb{M}$, it is instantaneously reset either in $\mathbb{M}$ or to one of the terminal states $x \in \mathbb{T}$, according to a measurable map $\Phi : \partial\mathbb{M} \to \mathbb{S}$, that we call the reset map.

Our interest for such processes has been motivated by a class of continuous-time Markovian models called Stochastic Hybrid Systems (SHS), introduced recently by Hu et al. in [2]. Roughly speaking, a SHS is obtained by replacing the ordinary differential equations by SDEs in a deterministic hybrid system. SHSs are not, of course, the only way to introduce randomness into the deterministic framework of hybrid dynamical systems. Notably, Davis [3] has defined and studied a wide class of non-diffusive hybrid processes. See [4] and the references therein for a survey of the litterature on continuous-time stochastic hybrid models.

The link between diffusion processes and the FPE has been known since the early days of Markov processes [5]. Let us recall some basic facts concerning the case of Stratonovich SDEs on a manifold without boundary. From now on, $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$ is endowed with a Riemannian metric $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ and we denote by $m$ the Riemannian volume measure on $\mathbb{M}$. Assume that $\partial\mathbb{M} = \varnothing$ and that the solution of ($\mathscr{S}$) has a density $p_t$ with respect to $m$, for all $t \geq 0$. Then, under some additional smoothness assumptions, $p_t$ solves the partial differential equation (PDE)

$$\frac{\partial p_t}{\partial t} \;=\; L^* p_t\,, \tag{1}$$

where

$$L \;=\; A_0 + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{r=1}^{n} A_r^2 \tag{2}$$

is the infinitesimal generator of the process, written in Hörmander form [4], and $L^*$ denotes its formal adjoint. Introducing the probability current vector

$$J_t \;=\; p_t\,A_0 \;-\; \frac{1}{2}\sum_{r=1}^{n} \operatorname{div}\left(p_t A_r\right)\, A_r\,, \tag{3}$$

---

[3] see e.g. Ikeda-Watanabe [1, Chapters 3 and 5] for the basic definitions.

[4] the notation $A_r^2$ stands for the second order differential operator $A_r \circ A_r$, i.e. in coordinates $A_r^2\varphi = \sum_{i,j} A_r^i\, \partial_i(A_r^j\, \partial_j\varphi)$.

where div denotes the divergence operator on $\mathbb{M}$, the FPE can be rewritten as a local conservation equation [6,7]:

$$\frac{\partial p_t}{\partial t} + \operatorname{div}(J_t) \; = \; 0\,. \tag{4}$$

The point of this paper is to prove that, for a SDE with boundary hitting resets, under sufficient assumptions:

- Equation (4) holds in $\mathbb{M} \setminus H$, where $H = \Phi\left(\partial\mathbb{M}\right) \cap \mathbb{M}$ is the subset of $\mathbb{M}$ where $X$ can re-enter the manifold after having hit the boundary; this is not really surprising, since the process behaves like a diffusion process[5] locally in $\mathbb{M}$.
- The well-known absorbing boundary condition, $p_t = 0$, holds on the subset of the boundary where at least one of the vector fields $A_r$, $1 \leq r \leq n$, is not tangential.
- There is a conservation equation for the probability mass flowing through the reset map $\Phi$, which is naturally expressed using the probability current $J_t$.

This will be stated more precisely in Theorem 5, which is our main result. Such a PDE was given by Malhamé et al. [8], for an example of one-dimensional SHS with two discrete states. Their proof is partly heuristic, especially concerning the boundary conditions. Our result extends their work in several directions, allowing for multi-dimensional domains and terminal states.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 2 we give a more precise definition of SDEs with boundary hitting resets, together with some of their basic properties. In the following section, we state and prove our main result, which gives the FPE equation for solutions of SDEs with boundary hitting resets. Finally, we illustrate the result with two applications, the first of which extends Malhamé's one-dimensional example.

## 2 The model and its basic properties

### *2.1 SDE with boundary hitting resets*

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered space carrying a $n$-dimensional $(\mathcal{F}_t)$-Brownian motion $B$ and $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ a right-continuous $\mathbb{S}$-valued adapted process.

---

[5] This is not a diffusion process, strictly speaking, since the paths are not continuous.

**Definition 1 (SDE with boundary hitting resets)** *We say that $X$ solves the SDE with boundary hitting resets $(\mathscr{S}, \Phi)$ up to time $\zeta^-$ if $\zeta$ is a positive stopping time such that, almost surely,*

*(i)* *for all $x \in \mathbb{T}$ and all $s < \zeta$,*

$$X_s = x \quad \Rightarrow \quad \forall t \in [s;\zeta)\,,\; X_t = x, \tag{5}$$

*(ii)* *$X$ is piecewise continuous on $[0;\zeta)$, i.e. has finitely many discontinuities on each compact set $K \subset [0;\zeta)$,*

*(iii)* *$X$ solves the SDE $(\mathscr{S})$ on each interval of continuity $I \subset [0;\zeta \wedge \tau^*)$, where $\tau^*$ is the first-entrance time of $X$ into $\mathbb{T}$,*

*(iv)* *and for each discontinuity time $\tau \in [0;\zeta)$, $X$ has a limit on the left $X_\tau^-$ such that $X_\tau^- \in \partial\mathbb{M}$ and $X_\tau = \Phi(X_\tau^-)$.*

**Proposition 2 (existence and uniqueness)** *For each $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable $\mathbb{S}$-valued random variable $\xi$, there is a maximal pathwise unique solution $(X,\zeta)$ starting from $\xi$. More precisely, we mean that:*

*(i)* *$X_0 = \xi$ almost surely.*

*(ii)* *$\zeta$ is a positive stopping time such that $X$ solves $(\mathscr{S}, \Phi)$ up to time $\zeta^-$.*

*(iii)* *If $(X', \zeta')$ is another solution, then $\zeta' \leq \zeta$ and $X_t = X'_t$ a.s. on $[0;\zeta')$.*

**Proof.**

*Existence.* We first establish the existence of a solution using a recursive construction. More precisely, we construct a sequence of right-continuous adapted processes $(X^j)_{j\geq 1}$ and a sequence of stopping times $(\tau_j)_{j\geq 1}$ such that, for all $j \geq 1$,

(1) $X_0^j = \xi$ almost surely;
(2) $X^j$ has $N_d^j$ discontinuities, $0 \leq N_d^j < j$, which occur at times $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{N_d^j}$;
(3) $X^j$ solves $(\mathscr{S}, \Phi)$ up to time $\tau_j^-$;
(4) if $\tau_j < +\infty$, then $X^j$ eventually leaves every compact set of $\mathbb{M}$ before time $\tau_j$.

Let $Z^0$ be the solution[6] of $(\mathscr{S})$ starting from $\xi$, defined on the event $\{\xi \in \mathbb{M}\}$ up to the explosion time $e_0$. Exploding solutions are extended to $\mathbb{R}_+$ with the value $\Delta$, where $\Delta \in \mathbb{T}$ is an isolated point that acts as a cemetery. We set

---

[6] Thanks to the smoothness of the vector fields, equation $(\mathscr{S})$ admits a pathwise unique maximal solution on any filtered probability space carrying a $n$-dimensional adapted Brownian motion. This solution is defined on a random interval $[0; e)$, where $e$ is a stopping time called the explosion time.

$$\tau_1 \;=\; \begin{cases} e_0 & \text{if } \xi \in \mathbb{M}, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

and

$$X_t^1 \;=\; \begin{cases} Z_t^0 & \text{if } \xi \in \mathbb{M}, \\ \xi & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

It is clear that $X^1$ is an adapted process, continuous on $[0;\tau_1)$, which satisfies the conditions 1–4.

Now we construct $X^{j+1}$ and $\tau_{j+1}$ from $X^j$ and $\tau_j$, for $j \geq 1$. We set $X_t^{j+1} = X_t^j$ on $[0;\tau_j)$ and then distinguish between several cases when $\tau_j < +\infty$:

- when $X^j$ has no limit in $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$ at time $\tau_j^-$, we set $\tau_{j+1} = \tau_j$ and $X_t^{j+1} = \Delta$ for $t \geq \tau_j$;
- when $X^j$ has a limit in $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$ at time $\tau_j^-$ which belongs to $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbb{T})$, we set $\tau_{j+1} = +\infty$ and $X_t^{j+1} = \Phi(X^j(\tau_j^-))$ for $t \geq \tau_j$;
- and when $X^j$ has a limit in $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$ at time $\tau_j^-$ which belongs to $\partial\mathbb{M} \setminus \Phi^{-1}(\mathbb{M})$, we set $\tau_{j+1} = \tau_j + e_j$ and $X_t^{j+1} = Z^j(t-\tau_j)$, where $Z_t^j$ is the solution of $(\mathscr{S})$ with respect to the Brownian motion $\tilde{B}_u^j = B_{\tau_j+u} - B_{\tau_j}$, starting from $\Phi(X^j(\tau_j^-))$ and defined up to the explosion time $e_j$. Note that $\tilde{B}^j$ is a Brownian motion with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{\tau_j+u})_{u\geq 0}$.

It is not difficult to check that $X^{j+1}$ satisfies the conditions 1–4. The only technical point is to verify that it is a $(\mathcal{F}_t)$-adapted process: this comes from the fact that $Z^j$ is progressively measurable with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{\tau_j+u})_{u\geq 0}$. Everything else is a direct consequence of our construction. Finally, setting $\zeta = \lim_{j\to+\infty} \tau_j$ and $X_t = \lim_{j\to+\infty} X^j(t)$, we obtain a solution of $(\mathscr{S},\Phi)$ up to time $\zeta^-$, starting from $\xi$.

*Pathwise uniqueness.* Let $(X',\zeta')$ be another solution starting from $\xi$. We use that the solution of $(\mathscr{S})$ with a given initial condition is pathwise unique, to deduce by recurrence that $X = X'$ almost surely on the interval $[0;\tau_j \wedge \zeta')$, for all $j \geq 1$, and therefore $X = X'$ almost surely on $[0;\zeta \wedge \zeta')$ since $\tau_j \to \zeta$. Then we observe that the solution $X$ which has been constructed in the first part of the proof cannot be extended beyond the lifetime $\zeta$. Indeed, when $\zeta < +\infty$, one of the following two situations takes place:

- if $N_d = \lim_{j\to+\infty} N_d^j < +\infty$, the solution is exploding in $\mathbb{M}$ at time $\tau_{N_d+1}^-$ and has no limit in $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$;
- if $N_d = +\infty$, the sequence $\tau_j$ has an accumulation point at time $\zeta^-$ and therefore cannot be extended beyond $\zeta$ without losing the piecewise continuity.

This implies that $\zeta' \leq \zeta$, which completes the proof. $\square$

### *2.2 Basic properties*

Proposition 2 shows that, in general, the solution of a SDE with boundary hitting resets cannot be defined for all $t \geq 0$, either because the solution of the SDE behaves badly or because the process undergoes an infinite number of resets within a finite time[7]. Let $(X^x, \zeta^x)$ be the maximal solution of $(\mathscr{S}, \Phi)$ starting from $x \in \mathbb{S}$. We assume from now on that

$(\mathbf{A_1})$ for all $x \in \mathbb{S}$, the solution $X^x$ has an infinite lifetime, i.e. $\zeta^x = +\infty$ almost surely.

Let $(R, \mathcal{R}, (\mathcal{R}_t)_{t\geq 0})$ be the canonical filtered space of all right-continuous paths $\omega : t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \omega(t) \in \mathbb{S}$, with coordinate process $X_t : \omega \mapsto \omega(t), t \geq 0$. We set $\tilde{\Omega} = \Omega \times R$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{R}$. For all $x \in \mathbb{S}$, we denote by $\mathbb{P}_x$ the probability law on $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}})$ defined as the image of $\mathbb{P}$ by the application $(\mathrm{Id}, X^x)$. In other words, $\mathbb{P}_x$ is the extension of $\mathbb{P}$ such that $X$ is the solution of $(\mathscr{S}, \Phi)$ starting from $x$. The space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}})$ is endowed with the filtration $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\geq 0}$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t = \mathcal{F}_t \otimes \mathcal{R}_t$.

Let $\overline{\mathbb{S}}$ be the extended state space obtained as the union of the state space $\mathbb{S}$ and the boundary $\partial\mathbb{M}$, i.e. $\overline{\mathbb{S}} = \mathbb{S} \cup \partial\mathbb{M} = \overline{\mathbb{M}} \cup \mathbb{T}$. We denote by $C^k_c(\overline{\mathbb{M}})$ the set of compactly supported functions of class $C^k$ on $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$. For convenience, we use the notation $C^k(\overline{\mathbb{S}})$, resp. $C^k_c(\overline{\mathbb{S}})$, to denote the set of all functions $\varphi : \overline{\mathbb{S}} \to \mathbb{R}$ whose restriction to $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$ belongs to $C^k(\overline{\mathbb{M}})$, resp. $C^k_c(\overline{\mathbb{M}})$. Moreover, we extend the vector fields $A_r$, $0 \leq r \leq n$, setting

$$(A_r\varphi)(x) = 0, \qquad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{T}. \tag{8}$$

As in the proof of Proposition 2, we denote $\tau_j$ the stopping time corresponding to the $j^{\text{th}}$ jump, $j \geq 1$, with the convention that $\tau_j = +\infty$ if the process has less than $j$ jumps.

---

[7] This is what people in the hybrid systems community call the Zeno phenomenon [9], in reference to Zeno of Elea and his famous paradoxes.

**Proposition 3** *The family $\{\mathbb{P}_x,\, x \in \mathbb{S}\}$ is a Markovian system of probability measures on $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, (\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\geq 0})$ with the following properties:*

*(i) For all $x \in \mathbb{S}$, $\varphi \in C^2(\overline{\mathbb{S}})$ and $t \geq 0$, it holds $\mathbb{P}_x$-almost surely that*

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(X_t) \;=\; \varphi(x) \,+\, \int_0^t \left(A_0\varphi\right)(X_s)\; ds \,+\, \sum_{r=1}^n \int_0^t \left(A_r\varphi\right)(X_s) \,\circ\, \mathrm{d}B_s^r \\ +\, \sum_{\tau_j \leq t} \,(\varphi \circ \Phi - \varphi)\left(X_{\tau_j}^-\right)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

*(ii) Let $\mu_0$ be any probability measure on $\mathbb{S}$. Then, for all $\varphi \in C_c^2(\overline{\mathbb{S}})$ and for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}\left\{\varphi(X_t)\right\} \;=\; \mu_0(\varphi) \,+\, \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}\left\{\int_0^t \left(L\varphi\right)(X_s)\; ds\right\} \\ +\, \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}\left\{\sum_{\tau_j \leq t} \,(\varphi \circ \Phi - \varphi)\left(X_{\tau_j}^-\right)\right\},\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

*where $L$ is given by (2) and $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}$ denotes as usual the expectation with respect to the probability measure $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_0} = \int_{\mathbb{S}} \mu_0(\mathrm{d}x)\, \mathbb{P}_x$.*

**Proof.** Using the usual chain rule on the intervals of continuity and a recurrence on $k$, it is easy to show that, for all $k \geq 1$, $\mathbb{P}_x$-almost surely,

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(X_t) \;=\; \varphi(x) \,+\, \int_0^t \left(A_0\varphi\right)(X_s)\; ds \,+\, \sum_{r=1}^n \int_0^t \left(A_r\varphi\right)(X_s) \,\circ\, \mathrm{d}B_s^r \\ +\, \sum_{\tau_j \leq t} \left(\varphi\left(X_{\tau_j}\right) - \varphi\left(X_{\tau_j}^-\right)\right)\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

on $[0;\tau_j)$. This equation holds in fact on $[0;+\infty)$ since $\tau_j \to +\infty$. Moreover, we have that $X_{\tau_j} = \Phi(X_{\tau_j}^-)$ by Definition 1(iv), which establishes (9).

Now we assume that $\varphi$ is compactly supported. The connection between Stratonovich integrals and Itō integrals (see e.g. [1, Theorem V.1.2]) yields

$$\left(A_r\varphi\right)(X_s) \,\circ\, \mathrm{d}B_s^r \;=\; \left(A_r\varphi\right)(X_s)\;\, \mathrm{d}B_s^r + \frac{1}{2}\left(A_r^2\varphi\right)(X_s)\;\, \mathrm{d}s\,, \quad 1 \leq r \leq n\,. \tag{12}$$

Therefore, equation (9) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(X_t) \;=\; \varphi(x) \,+\, \int_0^t \left(L\varphi\right)(X_s)\; ds \,+\, \sum_{r=1}^n \int_0^t \left(A_r\varphi\right)(X_s)\;\, \mathrm{d}B_s^r \\ +\, \sum_{\tau_j \leq t} \,(\varphi \circ \Phi - \varphi)\left(X_{\tau_j}^-\right)\,,\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

and equation (10) is obtained by taking expectations and using that the process $M_t^\varphi = \sum_{1\leq r\leq n} \int_0^t (A_r\varphi)(X_s)\, \mathrm{d}B_s^r$ is a martingale (since $A_r\varphi$ is bounded).

*Proof of the Markov property.* We define the semigroup $(P_t)_{t\geq 0}$, as usual, by $(P_t\varphi)(x) = \mathbb{E}_x\left\{\varphi(X_t)\right\}$. Then, for all $s < t$, using equation (9) and the martingale property of $M_t^{\varphi}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_x\left\{\varphi(X_t) \,|\, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_s\right\} && (14) \\ & = \mathbb{E}_x\left\{\varphi(X_s) + \int_s^t (L\varphi)(X_s)\, ds + \sum_{s<\tau_j\leq t} (\varphi\circ\Phi - \varphi)\left(X_{\tau_j}^-\right) \,|\, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_s\right\} && (15) \\ & = (P_{t-s}\varphi)(X_s)\,. && (16) \end{aligned}$$

The last line follows from (10) and the fact that, under the probability $\mathbb{P}_x\{\,\cdot\,|\,\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_s\}$, the process $(X_{s+u})_{u\geq 0}$ is the maximal solution of $(\mathscr{S},\Phi)$ starting from $X_s$ and driven by $(B_{s+u})_{u\geq 0}$. Therefore, it has the same distribution as $(X, B)$ under $\mathbb{P}_{X_s}$ (this is a consequence of the uniqueness in law for $(\mathscr{S})$, using a proof similar to that of Proposition 2). □

*Remark 4.* The same Markov process can also be obtained using the "revival theorem" of Ikeda-Nagasawa-Watanabe [10,11]. This can be found with full details in [12], in a framework which is much more general than ours. The idea is to restart the process $X^1$ in the proof of Proposition 2, according to the deterministic kernel $N(\omega, .) = \delta_{\Phi(X^1(\tau_1^-(\omega),\omega))}$. We have preferred a more explicit pathwise construction, which, we hope, provides a better insight into the behaviour of the process.

## 3 Fokker-Planck-Kolmogorov's forward equation

### *3.1 Main result of the paper*

Let $\mu_0$ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{S}$, and denote by $\mu_t$ the probability law of $X_t$ at time $t \geq 0$ under $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_0}$. We assume that

($\mathbf{A_2}$) for all $t \geq 0$, $\mu_t$ has a density $p_t = p(\cdot, t)$ on $\mathbb{M}$, with respect to the Riemannian volume measure $m$.

Consequently, we can decompose $\mu_t$ as

$$\mu_t \;=\; p_t\, m \;+\; \sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}} q(x,t)\, \delta_x, \tag{17}$$

where $q(x,t) \;=\; \mu_t\left(\{x\}\right) \;=\; \mathbb{P}_{\mu_0}\left\{X_t = x\right\}$.

*Assumptions about the boundary and the reset function.* Set $G = \Phi^{-1}(H)$. Since the boundary is zero-dimensional when $n = 1$, our assumptions will be slightly different in the one-dimensional case and in the multi-dimensional case. First, regardless of the dimension, we assume that

($\mathbf{A_3}$) $\Phi_{|G}$ is a bijection from $G$ to $H$[8].

In the multi-dimensional case, we further assume that

($\mathbf{A_4}$) $H$ is a closed and orientable hypersurface[9], and $\Phi_{|G}$ is a $C^2$–diffeomorphism from $G$ to $H$.

Let $\sigma$ be the surface measure induced by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\partial\mathbb{M}$ and $H$, when $n \geq 2$. We define $h = |\operatorname{Jac}\Phi|$ on $G$, where $\operatorname{Jac}\Phi$ is the Jacobian of $\Phi$ with respect to the Riemannian volume forms on $G$ and $H$ (for any choice of orientation), such that, for all $f \in C_c^0(H)$,

$$\int_H f \, \mathrm{d}\sigma \;=\; \int_G f \circ \Phi \, h \, \mathrm{d}\sigma \tag{18}$$

The same formula holds in the one-dimensional case if we set $h = 1$ and interpret $\sigma$ as the counting measure on $\partial\mathbb{M} \cup H$.

*Smoothness assumptions for the probability law.* Finally, we assume that $p$ and $q$ are smooth enough, that is:

($\mathbf{A_5}$) $p$ is of class $C^{2,1}$ on $(\mathbb{M} \setminus H) \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Morevover, for all $t \geq 0$, $p_t$ is continuous on $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$, and the differential $\mathrm{d}p_t$ is continuous on $\overline{\mathbb{M}} \setminus H$ with a discontinuity of the first kind on $H$.

($\mathbf{A_6}$) For each $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $t \mapsto q\,(x, t)$ is continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}_+$.

Note that we have not assumed $\mathrm{d}p_t$ continuous on $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$, since it is precisely the discontinuities of $\mathrm{d}p_t$ through $H$ that account for the jumping behaviour of $X$. Assumption $\mathbf{A_5}$ implies that, for all $t \geq 0$, the probability current $J_t$ defined by (3) is a $C^1$ vector field on $\mathbb{M} \setminus H$, that has a limit on $\partial\mathbb{M}$ and a discontinuity of the first kind on $H$. We set $J_t^{\text{out}} \;=\; \langle\, J_t,\, \nu \,\rangle$ on $\partial\mathbb{M}$, where $\nu$ is the outward-pointing unit normal, and

$$\begin{aligned} J_t^{\text{in}} &= \langle\, J_t^{(1)},\, \nu_{21} \,\rangle \,+\, \langle\, J_t^{(2)},\, \nu_{12} \,\rangle \\ &= \langle\, J_t^{(2)} - J_t^{(1)},\, \nu_{12} \,\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

on $H$, where $\nu_{12} = -\nu_{21}$ is the unit normal to $H$ directed from side 1 to side 2, and $J_t^{(i)}$ is the value of the discontinuous vector field $J_t$ on the side $i$ of $H$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$. The first expression makes it clear that the definition of $J_t^{\text{in}}$ does not depend on the choice of an orientation[10] for $H$.

---

[8] This assumption could easily be relaxed in our proof, cf. Remark 8.

[9] embedded smooth submanifold, without boundary and of codimension 1

[10] In fact, $H$ does not even need to be orientable for this to be defined [13].

**Theorem 5** *Under assumptions* $\mathbf{A_1}$*–*$\mathbf{A_6}$*, the law* $\mu_t$ *of* $X$ *evolves according to the following equations:*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial p}{\partial t}(x,t) &= (L^* p_t)(x) && \text{on } \mathbb{M} \setminus H\,, && (20) \\ \frac{\partial q}{\partial t}(x,t) &= \int_{G_x} J_t^{\mathrm{out}}\, \mathrm{d}\sigma && \text{on } \mathbb{T}\,, && (21) \end{aligned}$$

*where* $G_x = \Phi^{-1}(\{x\})$*, for all* $x \in \mathbb{T}$*. Moreover, the following boundary conditions hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} J_t^{\mathrm{out}} &= h\, J_t^{\mathrm{in}} \circ \Phi && \text{on } G\,, && (22) \\ p_t &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\mathbb{M}_0\,, && (23) \end{aligned}$$

*where* $\partial\mathbb{M}_0$ *is the subset of the boundary defined by*

$$\partial\mathbb{M}_0 \;=\; \{\, x \in \partial\mathbb{M} \,|\, \exists r \in \{1,\ldots,n\}\,,\; \langle\, A_r,\, \nu \,\rangle \neq 0 \,\}\;. \tag{24}$$

*Remark 6.* $\partial\mathbb{M}_0$ can be seen as the non-characteristic part of the boundary $\partial\mathbb{M}$ with respect to the operator $L^*$. Indeed, $L^*$ is a second order operator with principal symbol

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_2\left(L^*\right)(x,\xi) &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=1}^{n} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} A_r^i(x)\, A_r^j(x)\, \xi_i \xi_j && (25) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=1}^{n} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_r^i(x)\, \xi_i \right)^2 , && (26) \end{aligned}$$

where the $\xi_i$'s are the coordinates of the covector $\xi$ in any local orthonormal coframe. Therefore, $\partial\mathbb{M}$ is characteristic at $x$ if and only if $A_r$ is tangent to $\partial\mathbb{M}$ at $x$, for each $r \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$.

### *3.2 Proof of Theorem 5*

The result is obvious when $\mu_0(\mathbb{M}) = 0$, since $X$ is then a constant process. When $\mu_0(\mathbb{M}) > 0$, we observe that $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_0}\{\,\cdot\,|\, X_0 \in \mathbb{M}\,\} = \mathbb{P}_{\mu_0'}$, where $\mu_0' = \mu_0/\mu_0(\mathbb{M})$. Thus, it can be assumed without loss of generality that $\mu_0(\mathbb{M}) = 1$, i.e. that $q(x,0) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{T}$.

▷ As a first step, we will prove that, for each test function $\varphi \in C_c^2(\overline{\mathbb{S}})$ such that

$$\varphi \circ \Phi = \varphi \quad \text{ on } G, \tag{27}$$

the following equation holds:

$$\int_{\mathbb{M}} \varphi\; (p_t - p_0)\, \mathrm{d}m \;=\; \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{M}} L\varphi\, p_s\, \mathrm{d}m\; \mathrm{d}s \;-\; \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}\left\{ 1_{(\tau^* \le t)}\, \varphi\left(X_{\tau^*}^-\right) \right\}\,. \tag{28}$$

Indeed, (27) implies that the jump term $(\varphi \circ \Phi - \varphi)\left(X_{\tau_k}^-\right)$ in equation (10) vanishes when the process undergoes a reset into $\mathbb{M}$ at time $\tau_k$. Hence, there is at most one term left in the summation, corresponding to a possible jump from $\partial\mathbb{M}$ to a terminal state in $\mathbb{T}$ at time $\tau^*$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}\left\{\sum_{\tau_j \le t} (\varphi \circ \Phi - \varphi)\left(X_{\tau_j}^-\right)\right\} \;=\; \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}\left\{1_{(\tau^* \le t)}\,(\varphi \circ \Phi - \varphi)\left(X_{\tau^*}^-\right)\right\} \tag{29}$$

$$= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}} \varphi(x)\, q(x,t) \;-\; \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}\left\{1_{(\tau^* \le t)}\varphi\left(X_{\tau^*}^-\right)\right\}. \tag{30}$$

Using Fubini's theorem together with the decomposition (17) of $\mu_t$ and the fact that $L\varphi$ vanishes on $\mathbb{T}$, we can rewrite the second expectation in (10) as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}\left\{\int_0^t (L\varphi)(X_s)\;\mathrm{d}s\right\} \;=\; \iint_{\Omega\times[0;t]} (L\varphi)(X(s,\omega))\;\mathbb{P}_{\mu_0}(\mathrm{d}\omega)\;\mathrm{d}s \tag{31}$$

$$= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{S}} L\varphi\;\mathrm{d}\mu_s\;\mathrm{d}s \tag{32}$$

$$= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{M}} L\varphi\; p_s\;\mathrm{d}m\;\mathrm{d}s\,. \tag{33}$$

Using equation (17) once more, we can also expand the left-hand side of (10):

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}\left\{\varphi(X_t)\right\} \;=\; \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}} \varphi(x)\, q(x,t) \;+\; \int_{\mathbb{M}} \varphi\, p_t\;\mathrm{d}m\,. \tag{34}$$

Finally, replacing expressions (30), (33), and (34) back into (10) completes the proof of equation (28).

▷ The next step of the proof relies on the following version of Stokes's formula:

$$\int_{\mathbb{M}\setminus H} \operatorname{div} A\;\mathrm{d}m \;=\; \int_{\partial\mathbb{M}} \langle\, A,\, \nu\,\rangle\;\mathrm{d}\sigma \;-\; \int_H \left\langle\, A^{(2)} - A^{(1)},\, \nu_{12}\,\right\rangle\;\mathrm{d}\sigma\,, \tag{35}$$

where $A$ is a compactly supported vector field on $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$, of class $C^1$ in $\mathbb{M}\setminus H$, extending continuously to $\partial\mathbb{M}$ and having a discontinuity of the first kind on $H$. This formula is easily proved using the usual divergence theorem [14, Theorem 14.34] or the general results of [13, Chapter IX]. Using this formula together with the assumption $\mathbf{A_5}$ that $p_t$ is continuous on $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$, for all $t \ge 0$, yields:

$$\int_{\mathbb{M}} L\varphi\, p_t\;\mathrm{d}m \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{M}\setminus H} \varphi\, L^* p_t\;\mathrm{d}m \;+\; \beta_t(\varphi)\,, \tag{36}$$

where $L^*$ is the formal adjoint of $L$, i.e.

$$L^* p_t \;=\; -\,\operatorname{div}\left(p_t A_0\right) \;+\; \frac{1}{2}\sum_{r=1}^{n} \operatorname{div}\left(\operatorname{div}\left(p_t A_r\right) A_r\right)\,, \tag{37}$$

and $\beta_t$ is a distribution supported by $\partial\mathbb{M} \cup H$:

$$\beta_t(\varphi) \;=\; \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=1}^{n} \int_{\partial\mathbb{M}} A_r\varphi \, p_t \, \langle \, A_r, \, \nu \, \rangle \; \mathrm{d}\sigma \;+\; \int_{\partial\mathbb{M}} \varphi \, J_t^{\mathrm{out}} \; \mathrm{d}\sigma - \int_H \varphi \, J_t^{\mathrm{in}} \; \mathrm{d}\sigma \, . \tag{38}$$

A detailed derivation of these equations can be found in appendix 5.1. Using (36), we rewrite equation (28) as

$$\int_{\mathbb{M}\setminus H} \varphi \, \tilde{p}_t \; \mathrm{d}m \;=\; \int_0^t \beta_s(\varphi) \; \mathrm{d}s \;-\; \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0} \left\{ 1_{(\tau^* \leq t)} \, \varphi \left( X_{\tau^*}^- \right) \right\} \, , \tag{39}$$

where

$$\tilde{p}_t \;=\; p_t - p_0 - \int_0^t \, L^* p_s \; \mathrm{d}s \tag{40}$$

is well-defined and continuous on $\mathbb{M} \setminus H$.

▷ The last step of the proof consists in choosing specific test functions $\varphi$ in equation (39). First, it is easy to check that, if $\varphi$ has its support in $\mathbb{M} \setminus H$, then (27) is automatically satisfied since $\varphi$ vanishes on both $G$ and $H$, and equation (39) becomes

$$\int_{\mathbb{M}\setminus H} \varphi \, \tilde{p}_t \; \mathrm{d}m \;=\; 0, \tag{41}$$

which proves that $\tilde{p}_t = 0$, for all $t \geq 0$. Equation (20) then follows by differentiation.

Before proceeding to the derivation of the three other equations of the theorem, we shall state a useful technical lemma, whose proof can be found in appendix 5.2.

**Lemma 7** *For any $\eta_i \in C_c^2(\partial\mathbb{M})$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, such that $\eta_{1|G}$ is compactly supported in $G$, we can find a function $\varphi \in C_c^2(\overline{\mathbb{S}})$ such that*

*(i) $\varphi$ satisfies* (27),
*(ii) $\varphi = \eta_1$ on $\partial\mathbb{M}$,*
*(iii) and $\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu} = \eta_2$ on $\partial\mathbb{M}$.*

*Proof of equation* (23). For any $\eta \in C_c^2(\partial\mathbb{M})$, Lemma 7 provides us with a function $\varphi \in C_c^2(\overline{\mathbb{S}})$ such that (27) is satisfied, $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial\mathbb{M} \cup H$ and $\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu} = \eta$ on $\partial\mathbb{M}$. Then equation (39) implies that $\beta_t(\varphi) = 0$, for all $t \geq 0$. Using equation (38) and the fact that $\varphi$ vanishes on $\partial\mathbb{M} \cup H$, this can be written as

$$\sum_{r=1}^{n} \int_{\partial\mathbb{M}} A_r\varphi \, p_t \, \langle \, A_r, \, \nu \, \rangle \; \mathrm{d}\sigma \;=\; 0. \tag{42}$$

Moreover, by construction, $\varphi$ has the property that $A_r\varphi \;=\; \langle \, A_r, \, \nu \, \rangle \; \eta$, for all

$r \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, which allows to rewrite equation (42) as

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{M}} \left( \sum_{r=1}^{n} \langle\, A_r,\, \nu \,\rangle^2 \right) p_t\, \eta \, \mathrm{d}\sigma \;=\; 0\,. \tag{43}$$

This holds for all $\eta \in C_c^2(\partial\mathbb{M})$, which proves that $p_t \left( \sum_{r=1}^{n} \langle\, A_r,\, \nu \,\rangle^2 \right) = 0$ on $\partial\mathbb{M}$, for all $t \geq 0$. Observing that $\sum_{r=1}^{n} \langle\, A_r,\, \nu \,\rangle^2 > 0$ on $\partial\mathbb{M}_0$ establishes equation (23).

*Proof of equation* (22). For any $\eta \in C_c^2(G)$, we can find by Lemma 7 a function $\varphi \in C_c^2(\overline{\mathbb{S}})$ satisfying (27) and

$$\varphi_{|\partial\mathbb{M}} \;=\; \begin{cases} \eta & \text{on } G, \\ 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{M} \setminus G. \end{cases} \tag{44}$$

For such a function, equation (39) reduces to

$$\int_G \varphi J_t^{\mathrm{out}} \, \mathrm{d}\sigma - \int_H \varphi \, J_t^{\mathrm{in}} \, \mathrm{d}\sigma = 0\,. \tag{45}$$

Then, since $\varphi$ satisfies (27) and $\varphi = \eta$ on $G$, we have

$$\int_G \eta \, \left( J_t^{\mathrm{out}} - h\, J_t^{\mathrm{in}} \circ \Phi \right) \, \mathrm{d}\sigma = 0\,. \tag{46}$$

This holds for all $\eta \in C_c^2(G)$, which proves equation (22).

*Proof of equation* (21). This time we choose $\eta \in C_c^2(G_x)$ for some $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $\varphi = \eta$ on $G_x$ and $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial\mathbb{M} \setminus G_x$. Equation (39) then becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0} \left\{ 1_{\left\{ \tau^* \leq t,\, X^-_{\tau^*} \in G_x \right\}} \, \eta \left( X^-_{\tau^*} \right) \right\} \;=\; \int_0^t \int_{G_x} J_s^{\mathrm{out}} \, \eta \, \mathrm{d}\sigma \, \mathrm{d}s\,. \tag{47}$$

This implies by dominated convergence that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu_0} \left\{ \tau^* \leq t,\; X^-_{\tau^*} \in K \right\} \;=\; \int_0^t \int_K J_s^{\mathrm{out}} \, \mathrm{d}\sigma \, \mathrm{d}s\,, \tag{48}$$

for any compact subset $K$ of $G_x$. Since the left-hand side is increasing with $t$, this shows that $J_s^{\mathrm{out}} \geq 0$ on $G_x$, for all $s \geq 0$. Consequently, letting $K \uparrow G_x$, equation (48) yields

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu_0} \left\{ \tau^* \leq t,\; X^-_{\tau^*} \in G_x \right\} \;=\; \int_0^t \int_{G_x} J_s^{\mathrm{out}} \, \mathrm{d}\sigma \, \mathrm{d}s \tag{49}$$

by monotone convergence. Finally, observing that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu_0} \left\{ \tau^* \leq t,\; X^-_{\tau^*} \in G_x \right\} \;=\; q(x, t) \tag{50}$$

yields equation (21) and thus completes the proof of Theorem 5.

*Remark 8.* This proof can easily be generalized to the case where $\Phi$ is no longer a diffeomorphism, but still a local diffeomorphism such that $\Phi^{-1}(\{x\})$ is finite for all $x \in H$. In this case, we have

$$J_t^{\mathrm{in}}(x) \;=\; \sum_{y \in \Phi^{-1}(\{x\})} h^{-1}(y)\, J_t^{\mathrm{out}}(y)\,, \qquad \forall x \in H,\ \forall t \geq 0, \tag{51}$$

instead of equation (22).

## 4 Examples

### *4.1 Stochastic hybrid systems*

As a first example, we will give the FPE for a multi-dimensional SHS with two discrete states, which models the temperature in a house with $n$ rooms, $n \geq 1$, regulated by a single thermostat. This is a generalisation of the one-dimensional process that was studied in [8].

Let the $n$-tuple $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ describe the temperature in the $n$ rooms of the house, and $q \in \mathcal{Q} = \{0, 1\}$ the binary state of the thermostat. The global state of the system is then described by the variable $x = (q, \theta) \in \mathcal{Q} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, which has both a discrete and a continuous component, hence the name "hybrid". For a given state $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ of the thermostat, the temperature $\Theta_t$ evolves in $\mathbb{R}^n$ according to a SDE of the form

$$\mathrm{d}\Theta_t \;=\; f(q, \Theta_t)\,\mathrm{d}t \;+\; \gamma\,\mathrm{d}B_t\,, \tag{$\mathscr{S}_q$}$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and $f_q = f(q, \cdot)$ describes the action of the thermostat, the effect of the exterior environment, and the coupling between the temperatures of adjacent rooms. The switching of the thermostat is controlled by a linear criterion $\Psi(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \theta_i$. The thermostat switches on when $\Psi(\Theta_t)$ crosses some threshold $\Psi_{\min}$ downwards, and switches off when it crosses another threshold $\Psi_{\max} > \Psi_{\min}$ upwards. This can be described in the SHS framework as follows: we define

$$M_0 \;=\; \{\, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n \,|\, \Psi(\theta) > \Psi_{\min} \,\}\,, \tag{52}$$

$$M_1 \;=\; \{\, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n \,|\, \Psi(\theta) < \Psi_{\max} \,\}\,, \tag{53}$$

and then the so-called "hybrid state space"

$$\overline{\mathbb{M}} \;=\; \{0\} \times \overline{M}_0 \,\cup\, \{1\} \times \overline{M}_1 \;\subset\; \mathcal{Q} \times \mathbb{R}^n\,. \tag{54}$$

The process $\Theta_t$ evolves continuously in $M_q$ according to the SDE $\mathscr{S}_q$ as long as the thermostat is in state $Q_t = q$, and $Q_t$ switches when $\Theta_t$ reaches $\partial M_q$. Therefore, the hybrid process $X_t = (Q_t, \Theta_t)$ takes its values in $\mathbb{M}$. Considering the atlas

$$\mathcal{A} \;=\; \Big\{(\{0\} \times \overline{M}_0, \pi), (\{1\} \times \overline{M}_1, \pi)\Big\}\,, \tag{55}$$

where we denote by $\pi$ the projection $\pi : (q, \theta) \mapsto \theta$, $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$ can be seen as a smooth manifold with boundary, which has two components. The process $X_t$ is then the solution of a SDE with boundary hitting resets $(\mathscr{S}, \Phi)$, with the reset map

$$\Phi : \quad \partial\mathbb{M} \;\longrightarrow\; \mathbb{M} \tag{56}$$

$$(q,\theta) \;\longmapsto\; (1-q,\theta) \tag{57}$$

and the vector fields

$$A_0(x) \;=\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} f^i(x)\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_i}\,, \tag{58}$$

$$A_r(x) \;=\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_r^i\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_i}\,, \quad 1 \le r \le n\,. \tag{59}$$

We note that it is not always possible to view a hybrid state space $\mathbb{M} = \cup_{q\in\mathcal{Q}}\{q\} \times M_q$ as a manifold, since the domains $M_q$ have possibly different dimensions in the general SHS framework [2].

We will now give the FPE equation associated to $(\mathscr{S}, \Phi)$, assuming a priori that the assumptions $\mathbf{A_1}$, $\mathbf{A_2}$ and $\mathbf{A_5}$ are satisfied ($\mathbf{A_3}$ and $\mathbf{A_4}$ are easily checked, and $\mathbf{A_6}$ is meaningless here since there is no terminal state, i.e. $\mathbb{T} = \varnothing$). The metric on $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$ is the one induced by the Euclidian metric on each $M_q$, $q \in \mathcal{Q}$. The density $p_t$ can be seen as a pair $(p_t^0, p_t^1)$ of modal densities, where $p_t^q$ is defined on $\overline{M}_q$. These modal densities solve a system of PDE,

$$\frac{\partial p_t^q}{\partial t} \;=\; -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial f_q^i p_t^q}{\partial\theta_i} \;+\; \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a^{ij}\,\frac{\partial^2 p_t^q}{\partial\theta_i\partial\theta_j}\,, \quad q \in \mathcal{Q}\,, \tag{60}$$

where $a^{ij} = \sum_{r=1}^{n} \gamma_r^i \gamma_r^j$. Assuming that the matrix $a$ is positive, each modal density satisfies the absorbing boundary condition $p_t^q = 0$ on $\partial M_q$. Moreover, the PDEs are coupled by the conservation equations

$$J_t^{\mathrm{out}}(q,\theta) \;=\; J_t^{\mathrm{in}}(1-q,\theta)\,, \qquad q \in \mathcal{Q},\, \theta \in \partial M_q\,, \tag{61}$$

where the probability current $J_t = \sum_{i=1}^{n} J_t^i \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_i}$ is given by

$$J_t^i(q,\theta) \;=\; f^i(q,\theta)\,p_t(q,\theta) \;-\; \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{n} a^{ij}\,\frac{\partial p_t}{\partial\theta_j}(q,\theta)\,. \tag{62}$$

As in [8], we observe that the drift $f$ does not appear in the conservation equations (61), since the absorbing boundary condition holds.

### *4.2 A first exit problem*

Our second application deals with the following problem: let $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the solution of a SDE of the form $(\mathscr{S})$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$; given an open subset $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and an initial probability law $\mu_0$ such that $\operatorname{supp} \mu_0 \subset U$, we want to compute

$$r_i(t) \;=\; \mathbb{P}_{\mu_0} \left\{ \tau \leq t, X_\tau \in \partial U_i \right\}, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq D, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T \tag{63}$$

where $\tau$ is the first exit time of $X$ from $U$, $D \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $T > 0$, and $\{\partial U_i,\, 1 \leq i \leq D\}$ is a partition of the boundary $\partial U$. We assume that the closure $\overline{U}$ of $U$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a smooth manifold with boundary, whose interior coincides with $U$.

It is well-known [15, Section 5.4] that, if the PDE

$$\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial t} \;=\; L u_i \qquad \text{on } U \times [0;T], \tag{64}$$

$$u_i \;=\; 0 \qquad \text{on } U \times \{0\}, \tag{65}$$

$$u_i \;=\; 1_{\partial U_i} \qquad \text{on } \partial U \times (0;T], \tag{66}$$

has a bounded solution, then

$$u_i(x,t) \;=\; \mathbb{P}_x \left\{ \tau \leq t, X_\tau \in \partial U_i \right\}. \tag{67}$$

This provides a first approach to our problem, since $r_i$ can be recovered from $u_i$ using an integration with respect to $\mu_0$. Another possible approach is provided by Theorem 5: we introduce a set of isolated terminal states $\mathbb{T} = \{1, \ldots, D\}$ and consider the process $\widetilde{X}$ which coincides with $X$ up to time $\tau^-$ and then goes to the state $i \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $X_\tau^- \in \partial U_i$. This new process $\widetilde{X}$ is the solution of a SDE with boundary hitting resets $(\mathscr{S}, \Phi)$ on $U \cup \mathbb{T}$, where the reset map $\Phi$ is defined by $\Phi(x) = i$ for all $x \in \partial U_i$, $1 \leq i \leq D$. The functions $r_i$ can be interpreted in this framework as

$$r_i(t) \;=\; \mathbb{P}_{\mu_0} \left\{ \widetilde{X}_t = i \right\} \;=\; q(i,t)\,. \tag{68}$$

Assuming that the density exists and is smooth enough, the $r_i$'s can be obtained according to Theorem 5 by solving

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} \;=\; L^* p \qquad \text{on } U \times [0;T], \tag{69}$$

$$p \;=\; 0 \qquad \text{on } \partial U^* \times [0;T], \tag{70}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d} r_i}{\mathrm{d} t} \;=\; \int_{\partial U_i} J_t^{\mathrm{out}} \, \mathrm{d}\sigma \qquad \text{on } [0;T]. \tag{71}$$

where $\partial U^*$ is defined as $\partial \mathbb{M}_0$ in Theorem 5. We point out that our approach based on the forward equation requires the resolution of a single PDE, in contrast with the first approach, based on the backward equation, which involves the resolution of $D$ PDEs. The drawback is that, using the forward approach, the solution is only obtained for the given initial distribution $\mu_0$.

*Remark 9.*

a) From a practical point of view, such a method is of course limited to processes with a state space of low dimension, where the numerical resolution of the PDEs is feasible.
b) A similar methodology can be used to tackle the problem of reachability analysis for stochastic hybrid systems (see [16] for further details), at least when the target set is a closed subset with smooth boundary.

## 5 Appendices

### *5.1 Detailed derivation of equation* (36)

In this appendix we give a more detailed derivation of equation (36). First, we choose $A = A_r\varphi\, p_t A_r$ in (35). Using that $A$ is continuous on $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$ and that $\operatorname{div}(A) = p_t A_r^2\varphi + A_r\varphi\operatorname{div}(p_t A_r)$, we deduce that

$$\int_{\mathbb{M}\setminus H} A_r^2\varphi\, p_t\,\mathrm{d}m + \int_{\mathbb{M}\setminus H} A_r\varphi\ \operatorname{div}(p_t A_r)\,\mathrm{d}m = \int_{\partial\mathbb{M}} A_r\varphi\, p_t\langle\, A_r,\, \nu\,\rangle\,\mathrm{d}\sigma\,. \tag{72}$$

This allows us to rewrite the left-hand side of (36) as

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{M}} L\varphi\, p_t\ \mathrm{d}m\ &=\ \int_{\mathbb{M}\setminus H} A_0\varphi\, p_t\,\mathrm{d}m\ +\ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{r=1}^{n}\int_{\mathbb{M}\setminus H} A_r^2\varphi\, p_t\,\mathrm{d}m && (73)\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{M}\setminus H}\left(A_0\varphi\, p_t - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{r=1}^{n} A_r\varphi\ \operatorname{div}(p_t A_r)\right)\,\mathrm{d}m && (74)\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{r=1}^{n}\int_{\partial\mathbb{M}} A_r\varphi\, p_t\langle\, A_r,\, \nu\,\rangle\,\mathrm{d}\sigma && (75)\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{M}\setminus H} J_t\varphi\,\mathrm{d}m + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{r=1}^{n}\int_{\partial\mathbb{M}} A_r\varphi\, p_t\langle\, A_r,\, \nu\,\rangle\,\mathrm{d}\sigma && (76)\end{aligned}$$

We invoke the divergence formula (35) once more, with $A = \varphi J_t$, to deduce that

$$\int_{\mathbb{M}\setminus H} J_t\varphi\,\mathrm{d}m\ +\ \int_{\mathbb{M}\setminus H}\varphi\ \operatorname{div} J_t\ \mathrm{d}m\ =\ \int_{\partial\mathbb{M}}\varphi\, J_t^{\mathrm{out}}\ \mathrm{d}\sigma - \int_{H}\varphi\, J_t^{\mathrm{in}}\ \mathrm{d}\sigma\,. \tag{77}$$

Finally, combining equations (76)–(77) and using that $\operatorname{div} J_t = -L^* p_t$ yields the result.

Let $\mathscr{U} = \{U_\alpha,\, \alpha \in A\}$ be the set of all precompact coordinate domains $U_\alpha$, with coordinate map $\Psi_\alpha : x \in U_\alpha \mapsto (x^1, \ldots, x^n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, such that:

a) either $U_\alpha \cap H = \varnothing$ or $U_\alpha \cap \partial\mathbb{M} = \varnothing$;
b) if $U_\alpha \cap \partial\mathbb{M} \neq \varnothing$, there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_\alpha(U_\alpha) &= [0;\varepsilon) \times (-\varepsilon;\varepsilon)^{n-1}\,, && (78)\\ \Psi_\alpha(U_\alpha \cap \partial\mathbb{M}) &= \{0\} \times (-\varepsilon;\varepsilon)^{n-1}\,, && (79) \end{aligned}$$

and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^1}$ is the inward-pointing unit normal vector to $\partial\mathbb{M}$, i.e. $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x^1}$;
c) if $U_\alpha \cap H \neq \varnothing$, there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_\alpha(U_\alpha) &= (-\varepsilon;\varepsilon)^{n}\,, && (80)\\ \Psi_\alpha(U_\alpha \cap \partial\mathbb{M}) &= \{0\} \times (-\varepsilon;\varepsilon)^{n-1}\,. && (81) \end{aligned}$$

Any $x \in \overline{\mathbb{M}}$ has a precompact coordinate neighbourhood satisfying either (b) or (c). It can be shrinked to satisfy (a) since $H$ is a closed subset of $\mathbb{M}$ according to assumption $\mathbf{A_4}$. Therefore, $\mathscr{U}$ is an open cover of $\overline{\mathbb{M}}$.

Let $\{g_\alpha,\, \alpha \in A\}$ be a partition of unity subordinate to $\mathscr{U}$. For each $\alpha \in A$, we construct a function $\varphi_\alpha$ on $U_\alpha$ as follows:

- If $\operatorname{supp} g_\alpha$ intersects neither $\partial\mathbb{M}$ nor $H$, we set $\varphi_\alpha = 0$;
- If $\operatorname{supp} g_\alpha \cap \partial\mathbb{M} \neq \varnothing$, we define $\varphi_\alpha$ in coordinates[11] by

$$\varphi_\alpha(x^1, x') = g_\alpha(x^1, x') \left[\eta_1(0, x') - x^1\, \eta_2(0, x')\right]\,, \qquad (82)$$

where $x' = (x^2, \ldots, x^n)$;
- If $\operatorname{supp} g_\alpha \cap \partial\mathbb{M} \neq \varnothing$, we set

$$\varphi_\alpha(x^1, x') = g_\alpha(x^1, x')\, (\eta_1 \circ \Phi^{-1})(0, x')\,. \qquad (83)$$

These definitions are compatible since, according to (a), $U_\alpha$ cannot intersect both $\partial\mathbb{M}$ and $H$. $\varphi_\alpha$ is of class $C^2$ since the $\eta_i$'s are $C^2$ by hypothesis and $\phi$ is a $C^2$-diffeomorphism by $\mathbf{A_4}$. Moreover, $\varphi_\alpha$ is compactly supported in $U_\alpha$ because $\operatorname{supp} \varphi_\alpha \subset \operatorname{supp} g_\alpha \subset U_\alpha$. We extend $\varphi_\alpha$ to $\overline{\mathbb{S}}$ by $\varphi_\alpha = 0$ outside $U_\alpha$. We observe that $\varphi_\alpha \neq 0$ if and only if $\operatorname{supp} g_\alpha$ intersects either $\operatorname{supp} \eta_1 \cup \operatorname{supp} \eta_2$ or $\Phi(\operatorname{supp} \eta_1 \cap G)$, which are both compact sets. Consequently, $\{\, \alpha \,|\, \varphi_\alpha \neq 0 \,\}$ is a finite set because $\{\operatorname{supp} g_\alpha, \alpha \in A\}$ is locally finite.

Finally, we set $\varphi = \sum_\alpha \varphi_\alpha$. This is in fact a finite sum by the preceding observation, which implies that $\phi \in C^2_c(\overline{\mathbb{S}})$. The properties (i)-(iii) of the lemma follow then easily from our construction, using that $\sum_\alpha g_\alpha = 1$, and the proof of Lemma 7 is complete.

---

[11] We identify a point $x \in \overline{\mathbb{M}}$ with its coordinates $(x^1, \ldots, x^n)$ in the chart $(U_\alpha, \Psi_\alpha)$.

## References

[1] N. Ikeda, S. Watanabe, Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes, 2nd Edition, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1989.

[2] J. Hu, J. Lygeros, S. Sastry, Towards a theory of stochastic hybrid systems, in: N. Lynch, B. H. Krogh (Eds.), Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control, 3rd Int. Workshop (HSCC 2000), Springer-Verlag, 2000, pp. 160–173.

[3] M. Davis, Piecewise deterministic Markov processes: a general class of nondiffusion stochastic models, Journal of Royal Statist. Soc. series B 46 (1984) 353–388.

[4] G. Pola, M. Bujorianu, J. Lygeros, M. D. Benedetto, Stochastic hybrid models: an overview, in: IFAC Conference on the Analysis and Design of Hybrid Systems (ADHS03), 2003.

[5] A. N. Kolmogorov, Über die analytischen Methoden in der Wahrscheinlichkeitrechnung, Math. Ann. 104 (1931) 415–458.

[6] R. Stratonovich, A new representation for stochastic integrals and equations, SIAM Journal on Control 4 (2) (1966) 362–371.

[7] C. Gardiner, Handbook of Stochastic Methods for Physics, Chemistry and the Natural Sciences, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.

[8] R. Malhamé, C.-Y. Chong, Electric load model synthesis by diffusion approximation of a high-order hybrid-state stochastic system, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 30 (9) (1985) 854–860.

[9] J. Zhang, K. H. Johansson, J. Lygeros, S. Sastry, Zeno hybrid systems, International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control 11 (5) (2001) 435–451.

[10] N. Ikeda, M. Nagasawa, S. Watanabe, A construction of Markov processes by piecing out, Proc. Japan Acad. 42 (1966) 370–375.

[11] P. Meyer, Renaissance, recollements, mélanges, ralentissement de processus de Markov, Annales de l'institut Fourier 25 (3–4) (1975) 465–497.

[12] M. Bujorianu, J. Lygeros, Theoretical foundations of general stochastic hybrid processes, in: 16th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems (MTNS2004), Leuven, Belgium, 2004.

[13] L. Schwartz, Théorie des distributions, Hermann, 1966.

[14] J. M. Lee, Introduction to Smooth Manifolds, no. 218 in Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, 2003.

[15] Z. Schuss, Theory and Applications of Stochastic Differential Equations, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, J. Wiley & Sons, 1980.

[16] M. Bujorianu, J. Lygeros, Reachability issues for stochastic hybrid processes, Deliverable DSHS1, COLUMBUS Project (March 2003).